Wt sent

Ms Joanne Meyerowitz, editor
The Journal of American History
1215 East Atwater Ave.,
Bloomingto, Indiana 47401-3603

10/14/00

Dear editor,

In my letter of September 28 I wrote you,"Because not a word Luker wrote is true- and this is literal, not a figure of speech - I think you owe yourself, your publication, the history you corrupted a close to word-for-word response annd refutation to the absolutely incredible Luker atrocity you published without any checking at all although he is incredibly defamatory in his falsifications and fabrications and without a single cited source (for there is and can be none for fabrications) or suitable or credible authority of any kind."

After telling you that I was preparing a longer refutation of Luker's complete fabrication I asked you to send him a copy of that letter and the longer refutation to come. ~~And now you ask me if I'd like you to do that!~~

The paragraph following that quoted above is "Yet your magazine calls itself the Journal of American History with such an irresponsible corruption of it.With this you corrupt the minds of those who write and teach history. Or, you add to the corruption of it by those who in our society had the obligation to take the truth to the people. As no established historian or history publication did."

You now say your objective was to get a dialogue going. In theory that is fine but in practise getting the professional ignoramus Luker to do it is as impartial as having Hitler write impartially about his nazism. And when a single word can be defamatory and misleading, refuting it is not possible by another single word.By restriction to two pages is inevitably unfair and unbalanced. Especially when Luker invents the slander that Wrone, I and others are like the"Holocaust deniers."

I have published ten books and there is not any "theory " in any one of them. as Luker would have known if he had read any one of them. All ~~these~~ my books come from the official evidence, which I filed more than a dozen Freedom of Information Act lawsuits to get. On the assumptions In all I forced into the public domain about a third of a million pages. So, this indecent man you accept as an authority makes up out of nothing

at all that I hired Wrong to be my gofer. When I had all those records in my home, in my possession, and needed no gofer to travel a little less than half the width of the country to fetch those records already in my possession! ~~try to reach me~~. Wrone and I are among the few who do not engage in what is not theorizing but is fabrication. Which is what the government did before any critic could. And what the government did to make the impossible appear to be possible is again something the historians and professional writers of history have not told the people so they could understand that they had had a de facto coup d'etat.

There is no way in which you can eliminate the harm you have done to yourself, to history and to those of us the unending liar, which is what Luker is, with the scanty space you offer for refutation. As the Gerald Posners do, those whose ends are served by lies and libels will quote only what suits them. It is because fairness is impossible with the dishonest and unfair situation you made by having a subject-matter ignoramus with venom in his mind to do your Posner review. And let him libel and slander those who have done the work he has not done and write with authority, as he cannot and does not. He writes history as Hitler did. And when the libel is apparent-and intended- you don't care a bit because you will offer the injured a few words when a book could be written without recoding for history what should have been written for it.

When it is retyped you will get what will have to do me for history's record if our historians ever meet their responsibility in a society like ours.

I asked you to get Luker to provide his alleged sources for what can have no sources because it is fabrication, falsehood intended to defame, as it does.

That is no way to start a discussion, with fabrication presented as truth when not a word of it is. I suggest that you will help your reputation by asking Luker to provide his alleged source and then by publishing what he provides or does not provide. With me, if he provides anything at all for total untruth and fabrication, allowed to comment on it.

I regret that as you and others did in the past, you again fail to meet your responsibilities, personally and professionally. Sincerely, Harold Weisberg